



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/539,437

03/20/2006

Walter Gumbrecht

32860-000900/US

6672

30596

7590

05/21/2009

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.

P.O.BOX 8910

RESTON, VA 20195

EXAMINER

THOMAS, DAVID C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1637

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/21/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/539,437	Applicant(s) GUMBRECHT ET AL.	
	Examiner DAVID C. THOMAS	Art Unit 1637	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) DAVID C. THOMAS. (3) ____.

(2) Crystal Wilson. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 19 May 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Cheng, Frechet and Hodko.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The discussion focused on the combination of the secondary art references of Frechet and Hodko with the primary reference of Cheng used in the 103 rejection of claim 1. Possible amendments to overcome the prior art, particularly the detection methods taught by Hodko, were discussed. The Examiner explained the reasons for combining the reaction layers taught by Frechet with the detection system of Cheng.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Kenneth R Horlick/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1637	
--	--